immunohistochemistry (POLEmt: POLE mutated; MMRd: mismatch repair deficient, p53abn: p53+) represent the main pathologic features to define the prognostic risk groups in endometrial cancer. This study aimed to evaluate the correlation between the prognostic factors and the rate of recurrence in our experience.

Methodology We conducted a monocentric retrospective study of consecutive women who underwent surgical treatment for endometrial cancer at Department of Gynecology Oncology, Treviso Regional Hospital, between January-2017 to October-2020. Baseline demographics, histopathologic type, grading, FIGO stage, LVSI, myometrial infiltration, lymph node involvement (LNI), and immunohistochemistry (when available) were collected. The diagnosis of recurrence and his pattern (distant or pelvic) were analyzed on the basis of prognostic factors type.

Result(s)* A total of 146 women were included: 105 patients in stage I (72%), 15 in stage II (10%), 22 in stage III (15%) and 4 in stage IV (3%). The rate of recurrence was 13% (19 patients) with a median time to recurrence of 15 months (3-42). A univariate approach showed a significantly association between recurrence and histopathologic non-endometrioid type (O.R 3.13; $p=0.05$), LNI (O.R 4.05; $p=0.03$), myometrial infiltration (O.R. 2.84; $p=0.04$), positive-LVSI (O.R. 3.32; $p=0.01$), grading (O.R. 3.9; $p=0.0001$), FIGO-stage (II O.R. 1.64; III O.R. 2.91; IV O.R. 10.20; $p=0.03$), and p53abn (O.R. 5.10; $p=0.02$). We found no significant differences between recurrence and MMRd (O.R. 0.90; $p=0.8$), no POLEmt was found in our recurrence patients. A positive-LVSI related with a distant recurrence (O.R 8.00; $p=0.003$). In multivariate analysis, FIGO stage and p53abn (OR=1.1 and OR=5.3; p -value=0.05, respectively) were found independent predictors factor for recurrence. In particular, all patients with p53abn and recurrence were in FIGO stage I at the diagnosis.

Conclusion* All prognostic factors related to recurrence, and FIGO-stage represented the most significant risk factor. Instead, when we considered immunohistochemistry, p53abn resulted in a negative prognostic factor for recurrence, independent to FIGO-stage. Positive-LVSI presented an important correlation with distant recurrence compared to women with negative-LVSI and only pelvic recurrences. Risk factors are important to define prognostic risk groups and adjuvant therapy.

246

SURVIVAL OF ELDERLY PATIENTS WITH ENDOMETRIAL CANCER – PREDICTED BY PREOPERATIVE G-8 GERIATRIC SCREENING TOOL

¹K Anic*, ¹C Althoefer, ¹MW Schmidt, ¹S Krajnak, ¹R Schwab, ¹V Linz, ²C Westphalen, ³EK Hartmann, ¹M Schmidt, ¹A Hasenburger, ¹M Battista. ¹University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Mainz, GERMANY; ²University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Department of Geriatric Medicine, Mainz, GERMANY; ³University Medical Centre of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Department of Anesthesiology, Mainz, GERMANY

10.1136/ijgc-2021-ESGO.128

Introduction/Background* We evaluated the prognostic impact of various global health assessment tools in accordance to conventional prognostic factors in patients with endometrial cancer (EC) older than 60 years.

Methodology G-8 geriatric screening tool (G-8 geriatric score), Lee Schonberg prognostic index (Lee-Index), Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) and American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA-PS) – Physical Status System were retrospectively determined in a consecutive cohort of elderly patients with EC. Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses and Kaplan-Meier method were performed to determine the impact of the global health assessment tools on progression free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS).

Result(s)* 153 patients entered the study. In multivariate analysis adjusted for common clinical-pathological risk factors (e.g. histological type and stadium, histological grading, FIGO-stadium, tumor stadium and postoperative tumor burden) and different global health assessment tools (G-8 geriatric score, Lee-Index, CCI and ASA-PS) only the G-8 geriatric score retained its significance as a considerable and independent prognostic factor of 5-year OS rate (HR: 3.173; 95%-CI [1.436-7.010]; $p=0.004$) but not for univariate 5-year PFS rate (HR: 2.033; 95%-CI [0.925-4.468]; $p=0.078$). 92 patients (61.3%) were assigned to the G-8-non-frail cohort (cut-off value > 14 points) with an increased 5-year PFS and OS rate compared to the 58 patients (38.7%) classified as G-8-frail (PFS: 82.1% vs. 65.4%; $p=0.071$ and OS: 88.2% vs. 49.7%; $p<0.000$; respectively).

Conclusion* Preoperative G-8 geriatric score independently predicted 5-year OS in elderly EC patients irrespectively of the maximal surgical effort.

252

TYPE OF SENTINEL LYMPH NODES METASTASES AND ONCOLOGIC OUTCOMES IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER PATIENTS: AN ITALIAN MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL STUDY

¹F Martinelli*, ²A Buda, ³F Fanfani, ⁴F Legge, ⁵M Roccio, ⁶F Falcone, ⁷AM Perrone, ⁸J Casarin, ⁹A Perutelli, ¹⁰N Biglia, ¹¹P Scollo, ¹²F Romano, ¹A Ditto, ²D Ferrari, ³G Monterossi, ⁴F Murgia, ²C Paniga, ³G Scambia, ¹F Raspagliesi. ¹Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori di Milan, Gynecologic Oncology, Milan, Italy; ²University of Milan Bicocca, UOC of Gynecology A.O. San Gerardo, Clinic of Obstetrics and Gynecology; ³Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore; ⁴Ospedale Generale Regionale "F.Miulli"; ⁵Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, U.O. di Ostetricia e Ginecologia; ⁶Endoscopica Malzoni, Center for Advanced Endoscopic Gynecological Surgery; ⁷IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Division of Oncologic Gynecology; ⁸University of Insubria, Obstetrics and Gynecology Department Del Ponte Women's and Children Hospital; ⁹UO ginecologia 2 di Pisa; ¹⁰Università di Torino SCU Ginecologia e Ostetricia A. O. Ordine Mauriziano Umberto I; ¹¹Ospedale Cannizzaro, AO per l'Emergenza; ¹²Institute for Maternal and Child Health "IRCCS Burlo Garofolo", Trieste

10.1136/ijgc-2021-ESGO.129

Introduction/Background* The role of volume of sentinel lymph nodes (SLNs) disease (macro-micrometastases and ITCs) in endometrial cancer is not clearly defined. We aimed to assess predictive factors for SLNs involvement and recurrence free survival (RFS) in patients with endometrial cancer.

Methodology A multicenter retrospective evaluation of endometrial cancer patients with positive (macro-micro metastases or ITCs) SLNs, treated between 2003 and 2020, was performed. Predictive factors for nodal involvement (endometrioid vs non-endometrioid histology, grading, lymphovascular-space invasion (LVSI), myometrial invasion (MI), cervical stromal invasion, ESGO/ESTRO/ESP risk group), adjuvant therapy and oncological outcomes were evaluated.

Result(s)* 142 patients were identified among 12 participating centers performing SLN mapping. In 64.8% of cases a low-volume disease (≤ 2 mm) was found in SLNs: 33 (23.2%) ITCs and 59 (41.6%) micrometastases. Factors influencing volume of nodal metastases were: grading [p:0.002] (G1 associated with low-volume disease), LVSI [p:0.007] and MI $>50\%$ [p:0.008] (both associated with macrometastases). There were: 20 (14.1%) low-risk, 14 (9.8%) intermediate, 88 (62%) high-intermediate and 20 (14.1%) high-risk according to 2020-ESGO/ESTRO/ESP risk group (on uterus). 17 (18.5%) patients with low-volume disease (8 micrometastases and 9 ITCs) did not receive any adjuvant therapy. At a mean follow-up of 34.6 months (range 1–215) months, 21 (14.8%) relapses were recorded, only one among patients not receiving any adjuvant, none in the ESGO/ESTRO/ESP low risk group. The RFS at 2-years for the micrometastatic patients was 91%, similar to ITCs patients (79.1%), regardless of adjuvant treatment, but statistically better than patients with macrometastases (72.3%) [p: 0.026]. There was a trend to distinct RFS according to ESGO/ESTRO/ESP risk group, but none of the comparisons reached significance. The only factors affecting RFS were deep MI [p:0.03] and cervical stromal invasion [p:0.046]. **Conclusion*** More than half of patients with positive SLNs had low-volume disease. Grading, MI and LVSI predicted volume of nodal metastases. MI and cervical invasion affected RFS; while adjuvant treatment did not seem significantly associated with RFS in patients with low-volume disease. Longer

follow-up time and a larger sample size are needed to understand the role of adjuvant therapy in low-volume metastatic SLNs.

271

REAL-WORLD OUTCOMES OF PATIENTS WITH ADVANCED ENDOMETRIAL CANCER: A RETROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY OF US ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS

¹S Banerjee*, ²G Smith, ¹J Lima, ³G Long, ³N Alam, ³H Nakamura, ³D Meulendijks, ²BJ Monk. ¹The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust and Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK; ²University of Arizona College of Medicine, Creighton University School of Medicine at St Joseph's Hospital, Phoenix, USA; ³AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Cambridge, UK

10.1136/ijgc-2021-ESGO.130

Introduction/Background* Endometrial cancer (EC) is the most common gynaecological malignancy in the USA, and mortality from advanced/metastatic EC (AEC) is increasing. EC constitutes a heterogeneous group of diseases with distinct histological subtypes. We characterized the prognosis in routine clinical practice of women with uterine serous carcinoma (USC), endometrioid carcinoma, clear-cell carcinoma (CCC), carcinosarcoma, and EC not otherwise specified.

Methodology This retrospective study utilized electronic health records from the US Flatiron database, comprising structured and unstructured data from community and academic centres.

Abstract 271 Table 1 Patient characteristics

		All patients (N=2202)	Uterine serous carcinoma (n=551)	Endometrioid carcinoma (n=1317)	Clear-cell carcinoma (n=92)	Carcino- sarcoma (n=30)	EC not otherwise specified (n=212)
Median age at advanced diagnosis, years (interquartile range)		66.0 (59.0–72.0)	69.0 (64.0–74.0)	64.0 (56.0–70.0)	68.5 (60.5–74.0)	71.5 (63.0–76.0)	65.5 (59.5–72.5)
Race/ethnicity, n (%)	Asian	48 (2.2)	10 (1.8)	32 (2.4)	1 (1.1)	1 (3.3)	4 (1.9)
	Black/African American	318 (14.4)	145 (26.3)	124 (9.4)	16 (17.4)	3 (10.0)	30 (14.2)
	Hispanic/Latino	3 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)	1 (1.1)	0	0
	White	1401 (63.6)	309 (56.1)	886 (67.3)	60 (65.2)	16 (53.3)	130 (61.3)
	Other	233 (10.6)	49 (8.9)	142 (10.8)	10 (10.9)	7 (23.3)	25 (11.8)
	Unknown	199 (9.0)	38 (6.9)	131 (10.0)	4 (4.4)	3 (10.0)	23 (10.9)
ECOG score at advanced diagnosis, n (%)	0	1125 (51.1)	275 (49.9)	681 (51.7)	51 (55.4)	11 (36.7)	107 (50.5)
	1	539 (24.5)	136 (24.7)	333 (25.3)	16 (17.4)	10 (33.3)	44 (20.8)
	2	126 (5.7)	27 (4.9)	77 (5.9)	9 (9.8)	3 (10.0)	10 (4.7)
	Unknown	412 (18.7)	113 (20.5)	226 (17.2)	16 (17.4)	6 (20.0)	51 (24.1)
Stage at initial diagnosis, n (%)	I	407 (18.5)	82 (14.9)	290 (22.0)	8 (8.7)	3 (10.0)	24 (11.3)
	II	66 (3.0)	18 (3.3)	39 (3.0)	6 (6.5)	0	3 (1.4)
	III	1073 (48.7)	253 (45.9)	700 (53.2)	45 (48.9)	14 (46.7)	61 (28.8)
	IV	557 (25.3)	185 (33.6)	239 (18.1)	31 (33.7)	11 (36.7)	91 (42.9)
	Unknown	99 (4.5)	13 (2.4)	49 (3.7)	2 (2.2)	2 (6.7)	33 (15.6)
Health practice setting, n (%)	Academic	380 (17.3)	113 (20.5)	212 (16.1)	20 (21.7)	3 (10.0)	32 (15.1)
	Community	1822 (82.7)	438 (79.5)	1105 (83.9)	72 (78.3)	27 (90.0)	180 (84.9)
ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group							